important, but if they do not meet these three criteria, I would suggest they are not PIRs and should be put somewhere else in the order. For example, if we are interested in those bridges over the Chattahoochee but cannot answer the PIR, we can identify who is answering it, in either the friendly forces or the intelligence paragraph. In another example, if the battalion commander wants to track the movements of his companies during an infiltration, he will make "Report crossing phase lines" a reporting requirement in the coordinating instructions.

He can do the same thing for common but ineffective so-called PIRs that are really nothing more than SALUTE report reminders. A key to identifying these are that they're usually listed as commands rather than questions. Consider a "PIR" such as "Report enemy of platoon size or larger along Infiltration Lane Blue." Does this mean I don't have to report a squad? I don't think that is the intent. A better PIR would be, "Is the enemy located in platoon strength or greater within Infiltration Lane Blue?" We can send a patrol out to answer this, so it is collectable. If the answer is no, we will use Infiltration Lane Blue; if the answer is yes, we will use an alternate lane. In this example, the PIR is tied to a friendly action; it is not just a SALUTE report.

*Indicators* are definitely worth mentioning. These are pieces of the puzzle the intelligence analyst is looking for, and observations the average soldier can make. For example, a commonly seen PIR for a unit at the Joint Readiness Training Center is "Where is the enemy battalion supply point?" That might be a tough question for an infantry soldier to answer on the basis of his localized view of the world. But he can report indicators, such as an unmapped trail network with all-terrain vehicle tracks, a single-ship landing zone, a UH-1 hovering and dropping a bundle, an enemy that defends instead of breaking contact, and booby traps, mines, and obstacles around a concealed area. These might be listed as reporting requirements or indicators in the coordinating instructions. Indicators are "information," and that is what the infantryman can collect. An analyst can then process them into "intelligence." *(See also "Intelligence Considerations for the JRTC Search and Attack," by Captain Richard A. Berglund, INFANTRY, September-October 1993, pages 7-9.)*

A good PIR should be collectable, should have someone responsible for it, and should be tied to a friendly action. If you have information you're interested in that doesn't meet these criteria, put it somewhere else in the order—in the friendly forces or intelligence paragraph (that is, a PIR of interest to you but being collected by someone else); under reporting requirements (SALUTE items, if you feel you must emphasize them, and friendly information); or under indicators (items of information that may seem unimportant by themselves but which collectively produce a picture).

You may choose to interpret PIRs differently, and there are certainly enough definitions in circulation to please almost everybody—that is, everybody except the guy on the ground. No matter how you choose to understand PIRs, I ask you to expose each PIR to this simple question, "Does having this in the OPORD help, and what are my subordinates supposed to do with it?"

**Major Kevin J. Dougherty** is now assigned to 2d Battalion, 29th Infantry, at Fort Benning, and was previously assigned to the Joint Readiness Training Center, the Berlin Brigade, and the 101st Airborne Division. He is a 1983 graduate of the United States Military Academy.

# Four Ways
## To Increase Leadership Effectiveness

**LIEUTENANT COLONEL HARRY W. CHRISTIANSEN**

General George S. Patton once said, "Wars may be fought by weapons, but they are won by men." It is the human dimension of war—the integrated effort of the soldier's spirit and the leader's will—that wins battles. This philosophy is written into Field Manual 100-5, *Operations,* which states that leadership is the most essential element of combat power.

Effective leadership is the ingredient that creates the combat-ready soldier teams that will bring mission success, both in war and in operations other than war. There are four ways you can become a more effective leader:

**Exemplify Professional Ethics.** Professional values and ethics are the foundation of service to the nation. They promote mutual trust, confidence, and understanding between the leaders and the led. Values—our attitudes about the worth or importance of people or ideas—are powerful. Your values, as

shown by what you say and do, set the leadership climate in which your unit operates.

Effective leaders adopt and adhere to high standards of ethical behavior. You do this by internalizing and practicing the Army's professional ethos of duty, integrity, and selfless service. You instill these values in your soldiers by your everyday example.

Duty is a legal or moral obligation to do what is right, despite the difficulty or danger, and without being told to do so. It is taking the initiative and anticipating requirements. Duty builds a common sense of purpose and unity for soldiers as they encounter difficult stressful situations. Duty means being responsible for taking action to ensure mission success.

Integrity is being honest and avoiding deception. You show integrity by your behavior and by promoting open and honest communications. Integrity builds trust and confidence between the leader and the led. It is doing the hard right instead of the easy wrong.

Selfless service is putting the nation's welfare and mission accomplishment ahead of your personal needs. You show selfless service by undergoing hardship, danger, and discomfort along with your soldiers. Selfless service builds soldier team commitment.

Effective leaders establish an ethical climate in which their soldiers can succeed. If you take shortcuts, you teach your soldiers that shortcuts are okay. If you do what is right, your soldiers will also do what is right.

**Communicate with Soldiers.** Communication is the link between the leader and the led. Effective communication takes place when you understand precisely what soldiers are telling you and when soldiers understand exactly what you are telling them.

Try listening to your soldiers more than you talk to them. Listen not only to the words but to the tone of voice, inflection, pauses, and speed—they all communicate something. Notice the soldiers' gestures or nonverbal behavior, and watch to see if the verbal messages match the nonverbal. If you're observant, you will hear and understand the feelings behind the words; sometimes the feelings are the most important part of the message.

Effective leaders communicate in different ways, depending upon the situation and audience. The method must fit the situation and ensure that the soldiers receive and interpret the message as you intended it.

The most powerful communication is your behavior. You communicate standards by your example and by the soldier behavior that you ignore, reward, or punish. Talk is cheap; behavior is believable.

Preserving the dignity of the soldier, in any situation, will go a long way in helping him realize his full potential. Effective leaders communicate in a way that demonstrates respect for each soldier—treating all with dignity. This manner of communication fosters soldiers' pride and commitment.

**Build Cohesive Teams.** Warfighting is a team activity. Expertise in combat strategies and tactical competence cannot ensure victory unless leaders and soldiers work together toward a common goal. A close-knit team of soldiers, outnumbered and overpowered, can overcome a larger force and win, and it is unit cohesion that builds close-knit teams. Cohesion is the bonding together of soldiers and their leaders in such a way as to develop and sustain commitment to the unit and resolve to accomplish the mission.

Effective leaders bond the interpersonal relationships within their team—both horizontally and vertically. Horizontal bonding occurs as the team members share experiences and become interdependent as they accomplish missions. Vertical bonding, the more difficult process, occurs when soldiers become confident in their leader's technical skills and believe that the leader truly respects and cares for them.

Tell soldiers, by words and deeds, that you care for them. In addition, tell them how well they are performing as a team. Get personally involved with a new soldier's reception, integration, and acceptance as a team member. Conduct stressful, demanding training that requires the team to work together toward success. Emphasize and recognize contributions of the team rather than only of individuals.

One word of caution. Competition is a motivational tool within the Army. Although teams may compete successfully against other teams, it does not follow that team *members* will fight best if they are in competition with one another. Have them compete against a common standard, not against each other. Competing against a standard allows everyone—the team as a whole—to win. When individuals compete against each other, there is only one winner and often many losers.

Soldiers who belong to a high-performing team will do everything in their power to help their team succeed. An effective leader creates a strong unit identity—a feeling that "we're all in this together."

**Provide Purpose and Direction.** Effective leaders establish goals and objectives to guide the unit team into the future. Goal setting is a three-step process:

The first step is to create a vision. Leaders must know where they want to go—where they want to take the team. The first step in creating the vision is to assess the team's present state. Get feedback from the soldiers, and review SOPs and reports to determine the team's present state. Next, as you absorb this information, form a mental or word picture of what the team currently looks like and where you want the team to go. The vision can be a statement, a graphic, or any combination of these.

The second step is to establish goals. Goals are general statements that serve to focus the vision into a working framework. Setting goals is a group process done with subordinate leaders. Use words, pictures, or examples and be as explicit as possible. Ask questions to ensure that your goals are clear. Get subordinate leaders involved in charting the team's future; they are the ones most likely to achieve the goals.

The third step is to develop objectives for each goal. State the objectives in precise, measurable terms. In their simplest form, objectives state *who*

does *what* by *when*. Make them be realistic and attainable. Here, too, involve your subordinate leaders in this process.

Once you begin to implement the goals and objectives, conduct periodic follow-ups to check progress. Make mid-course adjustments in the team's direction on the basis of changing priorities. Conduct routine, scheduled follow-ups as a way to continue building your team.

Soldiers can do their best only when they know where the team is going and what their leader expects. Effective leaders provide direction and link the soldiers' work effort toward achieving team goals and objectives.

To improve soldier performance, effective leaders capitalize on interpersonal relationships with their soldiers. Effective leaders "talk and walk" the professional Army ethos. Effective leaders have open and honest two-way communication with their soldiers. Effective leaders build soldier-team commitment that is focused on mission accomplishment. Effective leaders provide a road map that the team members can follow until they reach success.

It is a leader's moral responsibility to be as effective as possible. Combat is the ultimate test of leadership—the outcome may mean the difference between life and death for your soldiers. Effective leadership makes that difference.

**Lieutenant Colonel Harry W. Christiansen** has commanded units at company-grade level and is a former organizational effectiveness staff officer. He is now a leadership development officer on the Army Staff.

### *FIFTY YEARS AGO IN WORLD WAR II*
### *September-October 1945*

***The end of organized Japanese resistance in the autumn of 1945 finally brought World War II to an end. One by one, Japanese garrisons on the Pacific islands and the Asian mainland had surrendered to American and Allied commanders, ending a reign of terror whose extent would only be revealed in the years that followed. With the end of hostilities, the world could now set about the task of rebuilding cities and societies torn apart in five years of conflict.***

***These and other highlights of the final year of the war are drawn from Bud Hanning's monumental chronology,* A Portrait of the Stars and Stripes, Volume II, *still available for $50.00 from Seniram Publishing, Inc., P.O. Box 432, Glenside, PA 19038.***

| | |
|---|---|
| *1 September* | *Allied troops now control much of the strategic terrain along the coast of Tokyo Bay.* |
| *2 September* | *The official and unconditional surrender of Japan occurs on the decks of the USS Missouri, in Tokyo Bay.* |
| *4 September* | *Brigadier General Lawson H.M. Sanderson, commanding officer of the 4th Marine Aircraft Wing, accepts the surrender of all Japanese forces on Wake Island. They had held the island since 23 December 1941.* |
| *11 September* | *Japanese Lieutenant Commander Hideyuki Takeda surrenders the surviving contingent of Japanese troops on Guam.* |
| *24 September* | *General Walter Krueger, U.S. Sixth Army commander, assumes command of all U.S. forces in Japan.* |
| *2 October* | *The London Conference ends with the Allies unable to agree on treaties for the Axis Powers.* |
| *3 October* | *In one of the first signs of things to come, a company-sized Communist force raids the Hsin Ho ammunition dump in China, stealing several cases of ammunition, most of which is later recovered by the 1st Battalion, 5th Marines.* |
| *6 October* | *Major General Keller E. Rockey accepts the surrender of 50,000 Japanese troops in Tientsin-Tangku, China.* |
| *10 October* | *Nearly 50,000 Japanese troops surrender to the 11th War Area Commander in Peiping.* |
| *25 October* | *The Japanese Tsingtao garrison at Shantung is officially surrendered to Major General L.C. Shepherd, U.S.M.C., and Lieutenant General Chen Paotsang of the Central Chinese Government.* |